Table 0.17: Comprehensive Health Assessment Program versus Advocacy Skills Kit Diary

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					
Participant s (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecisio n	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study event rates (%)		Relative effect	Anticipated absolute effects		
							With hand- held health record	With annual health check	(95% CI)	Risk with hand- held health record	Risk difference with annual health check (95% Cl)	
Health promotion (blood pressure checked)												
104 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ¹	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW ¹ due to imprecision	28/51 (54.9%)	26/53 (49.1%)	RR 0.89 (0.62 to 1.29)	549 per 1000	60 fewer per 1000 (from 209 fewer to 159 more)	
Health promotion (constipation investigation)												
104 (1 study)	no serious	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ¹	undetected	$ \begin{array}{c} \oplus \oplus \ominus \ominus \\ LOW^1 \end{array} $	5/51 (9.8%)	4/53 (7.5%)	RR 0.77 (0.22 to	98 per 1000	23 fewer per 1000	

Challenging behaviour and learning disabilities

Quality ass	essment						Summary	of finding	s		
52 weeks	risk of bias					due to imprecision			2.71)		(from 76 fewer to 168 more)
Health pror	notion (he	aring test)									
104 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ¹	undetected	⊕⊕⊝⊖ LOW ¹ due to imprecision	3/51 (5.9%)	10/53 (18.9%)	RR 3.21 (0.94 to 10.99)	59 per 1000	130 more pe 1000 (from 4 fewe to 588 more)
Health pror	notion (vis	sion test)									
104 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ¹	undetected	$\begin{array}{c} \bigoplus \bigoplus \bigoplus \bigoplus \\ LOW^1 \\ due to \\ imprecision \end{array}$	7/51 (13.7%)	11/53 (20.8%)	RR 1.51 (0.64 to 3.60)	137 per 1000	70 more per 1000 (from 49 fewer to 357 more)
Health pror	notion (we	eight measured)									
104 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ¹	undetected	⊕⊕⊝⊖ LOW ¹ due to imprecision	18/51 (35.3%)	29/53 (54.7%)	RR 1.55 (0.99 to 2.42)	353 per 1000	194 more per 1000 (from 4 fewer to 501 more)
Health pror	notion (we	ight manageme	nt plan)								
104 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ¹	undetected	$\begin{array}{c} \bigoplus \bigoplus \bigoplus \bigoplus \\ LOW^1 \\ due to \\ imprecision \end{array}$	5/51 (9.8%)	15/53 (28.3%)	RR 2.89 (1.13 to 7.36)	98 per 1000	185 more per 1000 (from 13 more to 624 more)
Health pror	notion (ep	ilepsy review)									
104 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ¹	undetected	$\begin{array}{c} \bigoplus \bigoplus \bigoplus \bigoplus \\ LOW^1 \\ due to \\ imprecision \end{array}$	11/51 (21.6%)	9/53 (17%)	RR 0.79 (0.36 to 1.74)	216 per 1000	45 fewer per 1000 (from 138 fewer to 160 more)

Challenging behaviour and learning disabilities

Quality assessment

¹ Optimal information size not met; small, single study

Summary of findings